



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Addr ss: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

PD

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/813,829 03/06/97 HOGAN

B 16016.0005

HM12/1227

DAVID G PERRYMAN
NEEDLE & ROSENBERG
SUITE 1200 THE CANDLER BLDG
127 PEACHTREE STREET NE
ATLANTA GA 30303-1811

EXAMINER

CLARK, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1633

9

DATE MAILED:

12/27/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/813,829

Applicant(s)

Hogan, B. L. M.

Examiner

Deborah Clark

Group Art Unit

1633



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Deborah Clark

(3) _____

(2) David Perryman

(4) _____

Date of Interview Dec 21, 1999Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: All

Identification of prior art discussed:

Wheeler et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants plan to remove the terms "embryonic stem" from the claims. The examiner stated that this would overcome the rejection made under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph and that under that condition the priority would be reconsidered. If the priority were granted to the earliest date, the art rejection would be overcome. In regards to the rejections made under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, applicants plan to clarify the definitions and to amend the claims to provide greater clarity.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Deborah Clark
DEBORAH CLARK
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1633